

<p style="text-align: center;">Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</p>	<p>Application No. 10/614,738</p>	<p>Applicant(s) MITRA ET AL.</p>
	<p>Examiner ALLAHYAR KASRAIAN</p>	<p>Art Unit 2617</p>

All Participants:

(1) Allahyar Kasraian.

(2) Jim Janniello (Reg. # 54,197).

Date of Interview: 29 January 2010

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 11:00 -11:30 a.m.

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejections under 35 U.S.C 103

Claims discussed:

1, 21, 22 and 23

Prior art documents discussed:

Devi (US patent Application Pub. # 2003/0147400 A1), Elie-Dit-Cosaque et al. (US Patent Application Pub. # 20040218525), Aukia et al. (US Patent # 6594268 B1) (hereafter Aukia) and Soumiya et al. (US patent Application Pub. # 2001/0037401 A1)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Allahyar Kasraian/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner and Applicant's representative discussed about the rejections in view of the applied prior arts. Examiner indicated since the first non-final office action (mailed on 10/16/200) there are 9 dependent claimed were objected as allowable subject matters. Examiner also requested the Applicant's representative to describe and clarify the claims 1, 22 and 23 and his view of the applied prior arts. Applicant's representative generally described the combinations of the references (or applied prior arts) are teaching away and would not be appropriate to combine. There was no particular agreement was reached and the Examiner would consider the Applicants' points of view in the further office action. Note: The interview with Mr. Janniello (Reg. # 54,197) was authorized by Mr. Kevin Mason (the attorney of the record).